REMARKS

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2007. Claims 1-44 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-44. The present response amends claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11, 13, 16-17, 19, and 31 and add new claims 45-47, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41-42, and 45-47. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.21(d) are submitted herewith.

An amended Abstract in compliance with M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b) is submitted herewith.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to state as a *"computer-enabled system."* Therefore, claim 1 should satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 USC §101. Hence, dependent claims 2-13, and 15-18, which are based on independent claim 1, should all satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 USC §101.

Similarly, independent claims 19 and 31 are both amended to include the statement of *"computer-enabled."* Therefore, both claims 19 and 31 should satisfy the statutory requirement

under 35 USC §101. Hence, dependent claims 20-27, and 29-30, which are based on independent

claim 19; and dependent claims 32-39, and 41-42, which are based on independent claim 31,

should all satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 USC §101.

III.   Claim Rejections – 35 US § 112

Claims 6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Here, Java is a programming language originally developed by Sun Microsystems and

released in 1995. As of May 2007, in compliance with the specifications of the Java Community

Process, Sun made available most of their Java technologies as free software under the GNU

General Public License. Hence, the claim scope is certain and refers to the programming

language which derives much of its syntax from C and C++ but has a simpler object model and

fewer low-level facilities. Hence, the use of "Java" should be definite and particularly point out

and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In addition, in claims 11 and 13, "Enterprise Java Bean" or "EJB" has been amended to

state as "*server-side managed component.*"

IV.   Claim Rejections – 35 US § 102

Claims 1-13, 16, 19-27, 29, 31-39, 41, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) and (e)

as being anticipated by Bau, III, *et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0005181.

Here, independent claim1 is amended to include the statement of *"wherein the enhanced compiler is capable of creating, deploying and/or managing at least one security type using a specification provided by the annotated source code, wherein the at least one security type can be applied to: request message, callback, response message, and request message and/or callback originating with an intermediate service in a chain."* In the prior arts, Bau fails to teach implementing a security type. Assuming Beged-Dov teaches the security type, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the annotated source code and enhanced compiler to implement different security types for a network-accessible service which is beyond the scope of merely incorporating a security type.

V. Claim Rejections – 35 US § 103

Claims 14, 15, 17, 18, 28, 30, 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bau, III, *et al.,* US Patent Publication No. 2003/0005181 in view of Beged-Dov, *et al.,* U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174241.

Here, claim 14, 28 and 40 are canceled. In addition, dependent claims 15, 17 and 18 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 as currently modified; dependent claim 30 which is based on allowable independent claim 19; and dependent claim 42 which is based on allowable independent claim 31 should all be in allowable condition.

Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:___09-07-07_____   By:_____/Kuiran (Ted) Liu/_____
                                              Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                              Reg. No. 60,039

FLEISLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

Customer No. 23910